



TOM TINDALL
Director

County of Los Angeles
INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT


1100 North Eastern Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90063

"To enrich lives through effective and caring service"

Telephone: (323) 267-2101
FAX: (323) 263-5286

January 14, 2013

To: Audit Committee

From: Tom Tindall 
Director

Subject: **REVIEW OF BOARD POLICY NO. 5.054
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR PROPOSALS**

Based on the request of the Executive Office of the Board, Internal Services Department, in conjunction with the Chief Executive Office, County Counsel and Auditor-Controller have reviewed Board Policy 5.054 - Evaluation Methodology for Proposals. At this time, we are recommending the following three revisions:

1. Reference Section – Add a reference to updated Exhibits 2 and 4 of the Implementation Guidelines.
2. Policy Section – Revised language to indicate actions taken to implement policy.
3. Responsible Department Section - move the Internal Services Department to the top of the list.
4. Date Issued/Sunset Date Section - extend the sunset review date to March 31, 2017.

Attached is red-line version of the policy, as requested by the Executive Office.

If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact Joe Sandoval at (323) 267-2901 or at jsandoval@isd.lacounty.gov.

TT:JS:LG:bg

Attachments

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Chief Executive Officer
County Counsel
Auditor-Controller



Los Angeles County **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS POLICY MANUAL**

| Policy #: | Title: | Effective Date: |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 5.054 | Evaluation Methodology for Proposals | 06/1/09 |

PURPOSE

Establishes Informed Averaging as the best practice method for scoring and evaluating competitive solicitations where proposals are evaluated and scored by a panel based on several factors, which may include qualifications, experience, and price, e.g., Requests for Proposals (RFPs) and Request for Statement of Qualifications (RFSQs). Ensures the retention of all appropriate scoring and evaluation materials.

REFERENCE

November 25, 2008 [Board Order 39A](#)

[March 17, 2009 Board Letter continued to and approved at the March 31, 2009 Board meeting, Board Order 55](#)

[May 20, 2009, Implementation Guidelines for Evaluation Methodology for Proposals Policy; Exhibits 2 and 4 updated January 2013.](#)

POLICY

Each department shall comply with Evaluation Methodology Policy to ensure a consistent process for the evaluation of proposals. This applies to competitive solicitations (e.g., RFPs and RFSQs) where proposals are evaluated and scored by a panel based on several factors, such as qualifications, experience, work plan, and price.

The Informed Averaging method, as shall be further described in the Evaluation Methodology for Proposals Implementation Guidelines issued hereunder, requires that evaluators independently review and score each proposal using the rating factors included in the individual evaluation worksheet. Evaluators then meet as a group to discuss, and following such discussion, then individually determine if they wish to change any scoring based on the discussion. The basis for any changes in an individual evaluator's score shall be documented in the individual evaluation worksheet. All individual evaluators' scores shall be compiled in a final evaluation worksheet and are averaged to complete the

evaluation process. All evaluator written notes must be included on the individual evaluation worksheets and/or the final evaluation worksheet.

Departments shall retain the individual evaluation worksheets and the final evaluation scoring worksheet signed by each evaluator (Evaluation Documents) consistent with the Countywide Record Retention Schedule for contracts as approved by the Board of Supervisors. There will be no discarding, shredding, or other destruction of Evaluation Documents pending the expiration of the applicable retention period per the retention schedule referenced above. All evaluator written notes must be included on the individual evaluation worksheet.

The Chief Executive Office, in consultation with Auditor-Controller, Internal Services Department, and County Counsel, ~~will~~issued Implementation Guidelines that are consistent with this Evaluation Methodology for Proposals policy. In 2009, T~~the~~ Internal Services Department, County Counsel, and the Auditor-Controller ~~shall~~provided training to all County departments on the Implementation Guidelines. The Internal Services Department ~~shall~~incorporated Evaluation Methodology for Proposal Policy and Implementation Guidelines into the Services Contracting Manual.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT

Internal Services Department
Chief Executive Office
~~Internal Services Department~~
County Counsel
Auditor-Controller

DATE ISSUED/SUNSET DATE

Issue Date: March 31, 2009
Review Date: December 18, 2012

Sunset Date: March 31, 2013
Sunset Date: March 31, 2017

SAMPLE

Instructions may vary by department
based on service and internal
established processes

Operational Plan
XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 000000
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET
RATER 1

Exhibit 2

Proposer: Joe's Parking, Inc.

INFORMED AVERAGING SCORING METHODOLOGY:

Each category will have a rating factor of Exceeds, Meets, Weak or Not Met. The Exceeds category has a point range; all other categories have a fixed score attached to the rating. If the evaluators determine a proposal rates in the "Exceeds" category, the points assigned to that factor must be within the point range indicated on the worksheet. At no time can the proposal be rated lower or higher than the range of points for the "Exceeds" category, or the fixed score for any other rating factor selected.

Portions of the individual evaluation worksheet will be reviewed and scored by the contracts analyst/subject matter expert. These scores will be presented to the evaluators for inclusion into the worksheet. These areas have been identified throughout the worksheet.

PROPOSAL WORKSHEET RATING FACTOR DEFINITIONS:

Exceeds

This rating should be given when the proposal clearly presents enough information that indicates a higher level than what is required in the RFP. For example, if the factor being evaluated is the requirement of three years experience and the proposal clearly indicates that the firm has ten years of experience and has provided dates to validate that claim, then they have exceeded this requirement of the RFP.

Meets

This rating should be given when the proposal presents enough information to ascertain compliance with the requirement of the RFP factor being rated - no more and no less. Using the previous example, if the proposal only includes dates verifying that the firm has three years of experience (and no more), then a rating of "meets" would be appropriate.

Weak

This rating should be given if there is questionable compliance, or if the discussion of the RFP requirement is brief or merely an affirmation that the proposer will comply with the RFP requirement being rated. Using the previous example, if the firm said they had three years experience, but did not support it with appropriate dates or client references, then a rating of "weak" is appropriate.

Not Met

This rating should be given in two situations: 1) the proposal does not address or acknowledge a certain RFP factor, or 2) the proposal indicates an inappropriate or different response to what is being asked for in the RFP. Using the previous example, a "not met" rating would be appropriate if the firm did not include anything about its experience.

SAMPLE

Instructions may vary by department
based on service and internal
established processes

Operational Plan

XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 000000
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET
RATER 1

Exhibit 2

Proposer: Joe's Parking, Inc.

| BUSINESS PROPOSAL (50% - 5000 maximum points) | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1 | Proposer's Qualifications (10% - 1000 maximum points) Sub-paragraph 2.9.4 | Exceeds 500- 400 | Meets 350 | Weak 150 | Not Met 0 |
| 1A. | Proposer's Background and Experience (5% - 500 maximum points) (Sub-paragraph 2.9.4 A., Proposal Section B. 1) Evaluation of the Proposer's qualifications, experience, and capacity as a corporation or other entity to perform the required services based on information provided in the RFP, Section B.1 - Proposer's Background and Experience. Consider years of experience in providing parking facilities management services; types of parking facilities operated such as self-parked, valet, stacked) number of spaces, annual gross revenue, period of time proposer has operated each facility, etc.) | 500 | | | |
| Evaluator's Comments: Proposer has over 10 years of experience in managing parking facilities and generates over \$1 million (Page 2) | | | | | |
| Review under Section 1B. (References) will be completed by the contracts analyst/subject matter experts. Findings and scores will be presented at the evaluation meeting for inclusion into the final score. See contracts analyst/subject matter expert's supporting documentation. | | | | | |
| 1B. | References (5% - 500 points maximum) (Sub-paragraph 2.9.4 B. | | | | |
| | Reference #1 <u>ABC County</u> | Reference Points: 500 | | | |
| | Reference #2 <u>Green Park</u> | Reference Points: 500 | | | |
| | Reference #3 <u>Event Management, Inc.</u> | Reference Points: 410 | | | |
| | | Total Points for References 470 (average of above) | | | |
| Review under Section 1C. (Other performance) will be completed by the contracts analyst/subject matter experts. Findings and scores will be presented at the evaluation meeting for inclusion into the final score. See contracts analyst/subject matter expert's supporting documentation. | | | | | |
| 1C. | Proposer's References: Contract Alert Reporting Database (CARD) (Sub-paragraph 2.9.4 C | | | | |
| | Zero (0) active CARD issues and less than three (3) resolved issues within the last five (5) years | (0 Points Deducted) | | | |
| | All issue(s) have been resolved but Proposer has had three (3) or more issues that were resolved within the last five (5) years | (Deduct 25% of total reference points) | | | |
| | One (1) confirmed active issue | (Deduct 75% of total reference points) | | | |
| | Two (2) confirmed active issues | (Deduct 100% of total reference points) | | | |
| | Points Deducted | 0 | | | |
| Proposer's Qualifications Section (1.A, 1.B, 1.C) (Transfer points to the Summary – page 00) | | TOTAL POINTS 970 | | | |

SAMPLE

Instructions may vary by department
based on service and internal
established processes

Operational Plan
XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 000000
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET
RATER 1

Exhibit 2

Proposer: Joe's Parking, Inc.

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| 2. Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services and Quality Control Plan (30% - 3000 maximum points) (Sub-paragraph 2.9.5, Proposal Section C and Sub-Paragraph 2.9.6, Section D) | | | | |
| 2A. Proposers' Approach to Providing Required Services (20%-2000 maximum points) (Sub-Paragraph 2.9.5, A) | Exceeds 1600-2000 | Meets 1400 | Weak 600 | Not Met 0 |
| Operational Plan Evaluate how the Proposer addresses the following factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Start Up Operations - implementation plan for providing the required services, including the training of new staff, installation of parking equipment, signage, number of type of equipment owned or available and time schedule to implement transition phase. Experience in working with electronic, automated parking equipment and the type of equipment utilized. Methods and procedures of deployment of staff and ensuring coverage for Parking Facilities with one attendant to accommodate staff breaks, scheduled vacations, and unscheduled absences. Proposed contingency plans for ensuring the continuation of required services in the event of personnel shortages or in the event the County requests to remove/add staff. | 2000 | | | |
| Evaluator's Comments: Proposer provided business and operational enhancements/recommendations custom to each parking facility lot (pg. 25), including staffing level, duties, and responsibilities. Proposer provided extensive information regarding the type and experience of automated parking equipment (pg. 30) Proposer described deployment of staff by scheduling at least 2 persons per opening time so that if one is late the second person is available (Table 1 of Proposal). Proposer addressed contingency plans by stating they have 600 employees, which allows them to draw from an extensive and highly trained labor pool (pg. 35). | | | | |
| 2B. Quality Control Plan (10%- 1000 maximum points) (Sub-Paragraph 2.9.6, Section D) | Exceeds 800-1000 | Meets 700 | Weak 300 | Not Met 0 |
| Evaluate the Proposer's demonstrated ability to establish and maintain a complete Quality Control Plan, including the following factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities to be monitored to ensure compliance with all Contract requirements; Monitoring methods to be used; Frequency of monitoring; Samples of forms to be used in monitoring; Title/level and qualifications of personnel performing monitoring functions; and Documentation methods of all monitoring results, including any corrective action taken. | | | 300 | |
| Evaluator's Comments: Proposer merely restated what was in the SOW without addressing each factor identified within Section 2 of the RFP. Proposer provided few sample forms. | | | | |
| Subtotal for Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services and Quality Control Plan (Sub-paragraph 2.9.5, Proposal Section C & Sub-Paragraph 2.9.6, Section D) (Transfer points to the Summary – page 00) | | TOTAL POINTS <u>2300</u> | | |

SAMPLE

Instructions may vary by department
based on service and internal
established processes

Operational Plan
XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 000000
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET
RATER 1

Exhibit 2

Proposer: Joe's Parking, Inc.

Review under Section 3.A. and 3.B. (Living Wage Compliance) will be completed by the contracts analyst/subject matter experts. Findings and scores will be presented at the evaluation meeting for inclusion into the final score. See contracts analyst/subject matter expert's supporting documentation.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|
| 3. Living Wage Compliance (10% - 1000 maximum points) (Section G) | | | | |
| 3A. Financial Capability (Sub-paragraph 2.9.9 A., Proposal Section G) will be evaluated by an independent third party who will make an Acceptable/Unacceptable recommendation to the committee. | | <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> HIGH MODERATE LOW </div> | | |
| 3B. Living Wage Compliance (10% - 1000 maximum points) (Section G) | | Exceeds 800-1000 | Meets 700 | Weak 300 |
| <p>A. Proposer's Staffing Plan (Sub-paragraph 2.9.9 B., Proposal Section G) Address the appropriateness, scope, and suitability of proposer's response to the staffing plan as identified on each Parking Facility Specification Sheet.</p> <p>B. Proposer's Approach to Labor-Payroll Record Keeping and Regulatory Compliance (Sub-paragraph 2.9.9 F., Proposal Section F) Evaluate the appropriateness, scope, and suitability of the firm's employee labor-Payroll record keeping system and the controls in place that ensures ongoing regulatory compliance. Did the firm include, at a minimum, a detailed discussion of each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What system does the firm use to document employee's arrival and departure Times (e.g., time clock system, sign-in/sign-out via computer, sign-in/sign-out sheets, etc.)? • How does the firm ensure that employees take mandated breaks and meal breaks? • Is the firm's labor-payroll record keeping system manual or automated? • Does the firm prepare the payroll or is it contracted out to a third party? • How does the firm calculate the total wages for individual employees at multiple wage rates (County's Living Wage rate for County work and firm's standard rate for other work) to ensure straight time hours, overtime hours, and travel time are paid to employees at the appropriate rates? • Is the system automated to handle variable payroll calculations or does the firm need to manually override the system to perform the calculation? | | | 700 | |
| Evaluator's Comments: Part time staff justification included minimal details. Proposer presented automated labor-payroll record keeping systems. No information provided as to how proposer ensures breaks are taken. Overtime hours are automatically calculated but rate was not provided. | | | | |
| Living Wage Compliance (Transfer points to the Summary – page 00) | | | TOTAL POINTS | |
| | | | 700 | |

SAMPLE

Instructions may vary by department
based on service and internal
established processes

Operational Plan
XYZ SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. 000000
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET
RATER 1

Exhibit 2

Proposer: **Joe's Parking, Inc.**

Review under Section 4: (Exceptions to the Sample Contract) will be completed by the contracts analyst/subject matter experts. Findings and scores will be presented at the evaluation meeting for inclusion into the final score. See contracts analyst/subject matter expert's supporting documentation

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| 4. Exceptions to the Sample Contract (Sub-Paragraph 2.9.7, Proposal Section E) Were there any exceptions taken to the Sample Contract? (circle one) If yes, were proposed alternatives acceptable? (If yes, circle one) | No <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; width: 30px; height: 30px; text-align: center; line-height: 30px;">0</div> Unacceptable 0 | Yes/ Major (2000) Acceptable 1000 | Yes/ Minor (1000) Weak 500 |
| Exceptions to Sample Contract (Transfer points to the Summary – page 00) | TOTAL POINTS 0 | | |
| SUMMARY | POINTS AWARDED | | |
| This section is to be completed by evaluator prior to finalizing individual evaluation worksheet. | | | |
| BUSINESS PROPOSAL (50% - 5000 maximum points) | | | |
| 1. Proposer's Qualifications (10%) - (1000 maximum points) | 970 | | |
| 2. Proposer's Approach to Providing Required Services and Quality Control Plans (30%) (3000 maximum points) | 2300 | | |
| 3. Living Wage Compliance | | | |
| 3A Financial Capability | High | Moderate | Low |
| 3B. Living Wage Compliance A. Proposed Staffing Plan B. Labor-Payroll Record Keeping and Regulatory Compliance (10%) (1000 maximum points) | 700 | | |
| 4. Exceptions to Sample Contract (Subtract Points) | 0 | | |
| BUSINESS PROPOSAL TOTAL POINTS (50%) (5000 maximum points) | 3970 | | |

Print Evaluator's Name

Signature

Date

SAMPLE

SERVICES - SOLICITATION NO. _____
FINAL EVALUATION SCORING WORKSHEET

Exhibit 4

Average Score
is derived by the sum of all rater's scores
divided by the number of raters

Proposer: Joe's Parking, Inc.

| Business Proposal Section | Maximum Points | Raters | | | Average |
|---|-------------------------|--------|------|------|---------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | Scores |
| 1. Proposer's Qualifications (10% -1000 maximum points) | | | | | |
| 1A. Background and Experience (5%) | 500 | 500 | 500 | 350 | 450 |
| 1B. References (5%) | 500 | 500 | 500 | 410 | 470 |
| 1C. CARD (deductions) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Subtotals: | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 760 | 920 |
| 2. Proposer's Approach to Providing Services and Quality Control Plan (30% - 3000 maximum points) | | | | | |
| 2A. Operational Plan (20%) | 2000 | 2000 | 1400 | 1400 | 1600 |
| 2B. Quality Control Plan (10%) | 1000 | 300 | 700 | 300 | 433 |
| Subtotals: | 3000 | 2300 | 2100 | 1700 | 2033 |
| 3. Living Wage Compliance (10% - 1000 maximum points) | | | | | |
| 3A. Financial Capability (Risk Factor) | High Moderate Low | Low | Low | Low | |
| 3B. Living Wage Compliance | | | | | |
| A. Proposer's Staffing Plan | | | | | |
| B. Approach to Labor-Payroll Record Keeping and Regulatory Compliance (10%) | 1000 | 700 | 700 | 700 | 700 |
| Business Proposal Subtotal (50% - 5000 maximum points): | 5000 | 4000 | 3800 | 3160 | 3653 |
| Deductions for Exceptions to Sample Contract: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Business Proposal Total: | 5000 | 4000 | 3800 | 3160 | 3653 |